

# NEW ZEALAND LIBRARIES

BULLETIN OF THE N.Z. LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, INC.

---

VOLUME 24 NUMBER 7

AUGUST 1961

---

## CONTENTS

LOCAL HISTORY SUBDIVISIONS OF THE NEW ZEALAND CLASS: A SURVEY AND A PROPOSAL, R. N. O'Reilly	149
BOOK REVIEW: Life on the Gold-fields of the South Island of New Zealand, a Bibliography, by M. M. Turnbull	161
NEWS AND NOTES: Another holder for Xerox reproduction of cards; Status for the 60s; Library Association of Australia; Reorganisation of British Library Association	162

---

R. N. O'REILLY

## LOCAL HISTORY SUBDIVISIONS OF THE NEW ZEALAND CLASS: A SURVEY AND A PROPOSAL

New Zealand has been ill served by the authors of classification schemes, and New Zealand librarians have done little to remedy a situation costly in wasted time for library users and catalogue departments. For me it began when Dewey, trapped by the term Australasia, included New Zealand along with Melanesia in his class 993 (following the East Indies 991/2) before Australia 994, New Guinea 995 and Polynesia 996. The correction is to swop over 993.1 and 995 as the library of the University of Auckland, and the Auckland and Invercargill Public Libraries have both done. But though 993.1 has always chafed, we collectively have done little about it.

The authors of the *Library of Congress Classification* made New Zealand an Australian state. It would not have mattered if New Zealand was the last in the sequence but it comes before Tasmania; and no New Zealand library using the classification appears to have been bold enough to swop over DU400-430 and DU450-480. Bliss escapes such difficulties of primary collocation but was not satisfied with the subdivision of OC New Zealand in his *A System of Bibliographic Classification*, 1935 and altered it in *A Bibliographic Classification*, v.3, 1953.

Mr O'Reilly is Librarian, Canterbury Public Library

## THE JAMES SUBDIVISION

In 1910 H. L. James, then Assistant Librarian, General Assembly Library, gave a paper to the first conference of the Libraries Association of New Zealand at Dunedin entitled *The Dewey System . . . and its adaptation to New Zealand requirements*. In it he outlined what is still referred to as if familiarly as the "James Subdivision".

One of the complications was his use of the letter Z as shorthand for 993.1 Since there is no clear rule for the use of such letters in Dewey they have since been superseded in most of the many libraries that once used them—and in superseding the Z (at least as meaning what James intended) these libraries also tended to supersede his subdivision which over the years had become unmanageable. However it (or schemes derived from it) are still in use in the Auckland and Dunedin public libraries.

The main source of difficulty in applying James lies in his closer subdivisions rather than in his broad structural ones. The structure, not immediately obvious from the way the subdivision is set out in the 1910 *Proceedings and Papers*, is worthy of study:

- 1 North Island
  - Including Hot Lakes, King Country, Taupo, and Ruapehu
- 2 Auckland province
- 3 Wellington
- 4 Taranaki and Hawke's Bay
- 5 South Island
  - Including Southern Alps, Cold Lakes, Fiordland
- 6 Nelson and Marlborough
- 7 Canterbury
- 8 Westland
- 9 Otago [and "Off Islands"]

One could quarrel with the order of classes 3 and 4 but generally this structure is sound and there appears to be no sufficient reason for radically superseding it, as later happened.

It became unmanageable for the very faults that make many of its rivals unmanageable: its subclasses were territorially undefined and either were (or because of the lack of territorial definition appear to have been) unsystematic, arbitrary, and incomplete.

Otherwise there is not as much to choose between it and its successors as those responsible for bringing them into being may have imagined. What, for example, is there to choose between its expansion of Auckland province and two of its successors' attempts?

<i>James, 1910</i>	<i>A 1946 Subdivision</i>	<i>A 1949 Subdivision</i>
1 Auckland city	Auckland city	Auckland city
2 Bay of Islands and the North	North Auckland	North Auckland
3 Hokianga and Kaipara		

<i>James, 1910</i>	<i>A 1946 Subdivision</i>	<i>A 1949 Subdivision</i>
4 Thames and Coromandel		
5 Waikato	South Auckland	South Auckland (Waikato, West Coast)
6 Bay of Plenty		Coromandel, Bay of Plenty
7 Poverty Bay		Thermal regions, Taupo
8.		Gisborne, East Coast
<i>Note</i> Hot lakes, King Country, Taupo, and Ruapehu classed with North Island	<i>Note</i> Main library concerned defines North Auckland as whole peninsula north of Auckland City, South Auckland in effect as balance of North Aucklandland district	<i>Note</i> Main library concerned has made itself a map of these subdivisions

If we concede that the southern portion of the north Auckland land district is more deserving of a separate class than Hokianga-Kaipara there is little wrong with the 1910 version that territorial definition could not have tidied up.

James's subdivision also had one useful feature that only one of its successors has copied: a subdivision of Maori history both general and tribal. (Examination of this is beyond the scope of this survey.)

Little is known to me of the events leading to the eclipse of James but one may fairly assume that the interminable work involved in classifying local histories under a scheme without territorially defined classes led to its lack of champions when the Association, at the end of the Second World War, took a hand in a new scheme.

It is also likely that these difficulties at the level of regions and districts led to the reaction against close geographical classification still prevalent in some New Zealand circles.

#### THE N. Z. L. A. PLAN, 1946

About the end of the Second World War the Wellington Branch<sup>1</sup> set up a classification subcommittee under Miss Alice Woodhouse, and in the November 1946 issue of *NEW ZEALAND LIBRARIES* (9:205) under the title "New Zealand History, Suggested Classification Plan" there appeared a subdivision of D.C. class 993.1 that soon became the main such subdivision in use in this country. In a letter to me dated 13 April 1961, Miss Woodhouse has this to say about its genesis: "... During my last year or two at the Turnbull Library it seemed

<sup>1</sup> Branch Notes in *NZ Lib* 9:13, Ja-F 1946 refers to subcommittee's report.

to me that something of the kind was essential, as the number of New Zealand books was rapidly growing, and many of them dealt with particular provinces or localities. So I drafted what seemed to me a logical extension of Dewey's 993.1, consulting other members of the Turnbull staff, and presumably also the other members of the sub-committee... and in due course the N.Z.L.A. classification was brought out, and was practically the same as my draft, with some minor alterations."

Here, for only the second time in print, are the geographical subdivisions of the N.Z.L.A. plan:

- 1 Auckland province
- 11 Auckland city
- 12 North Auckland
- 15 South Auckland
- 2 Taranaki
- 21 New Plymouth (Other provincial capitals similarly by adding 1 to the province number.)
- 3 Hawke's Bay
- 4 Wellington
- 5 Nelson
- 56 Marlborough
- 6 Westland
- 7 Canterbury
- 75 South Canterbury
- 8 Otago
- 85 Southland
- 87 Stewart Island
- 9 Outlying islands

This fairly succinct scheme was published at that time "In order that any comments on... [this] amplification of the Dewey classification of New Zealand history may be forwarded with the recommendation to the Lake Placid Institute..." In due course it was so forwarded.

At that time the 14th edition of the *Decimal Classification* was still current but Lake Placid was working on the 15th—the radically pruned edition of 1952. New Zealand in the 14th edition was in the unsubdivided class 993.1 and, with the tide running out against further subdivision generally, the Association's recommendation was not accepted. In the light of what the 15th edition turned out to be (and of the reclassification programme already in store for us due to rather different causes) that might have been the appropriate time to raise the question of changing from 993.1 to 995. But this is hind-sight: it would not have appeared in the same light then. The 15th edition added one subdivision to 993.1—Outlying Islands. The number chosen was not -9 but -1. This ominous move apparently occasioned no protest here.



In the meantime (in 1948) the National Library Service, with the Association's blessing, began its central cataloguing service for New Zealand books, and though no word of this appears in the announcement<sup>2</sup> in *NEW ZEALAND LIBRARIES* the N.Z.L.A. New Zealand subdivision plan was adopted for this purpose.

Though the N.Z.L.A. plan was evolved there, the Alexander Turnbull Library so far has not subdivided its class 993.1. The plan has been adopted by the library of the University of Auckland (but on the 995 not the 993.1 base), by the Wellington Public Libraries, and by perhaps twenty other New Zealand libraries. These are mainly the public libraries of the secondary cities and larger boroughs, but also include the library of the Hawke's Bay Museum—Miss Woodhouse herself has classified the Russell Duncan collection there by it. A major factor in its adoption by public libraries was the National Library Service move. Otherwise the libraries with large New Zealand collections have not followed suit.

#### WEAKNESSES IN THE N.Z.L.A. PLAN

The crucial criticism is that the N.Z.L.A. plan is not as it stands amenable to expansion. To those opposed to all close subdivision this is a virtue; while to others who do not feel there is yet the need for closer subdivision it is a purely theoretical weakness. However, a classification scheme that cannot be expanded is doomed.

The first source of difficulty is that the plan is a provincial one and (since the provinces were abolished as local governments) there are no longer territorial units collectively covering New Zealand that are at the same time simple subdivisions of the provincial district territories. Counties are the most suitable, probably the only, basis for the next level of subdivision. In some cases (e.g., Patea, Wairoa) the different provincial parts of a county are each worthy of attention; generally they are not. But the class territories can be redefined so as to retain their general provincial character while becoming compatible with subdivision on a county basis.

The second source of difficulty is the lack of definition of classes 12 North Auckland and 15 South Auckland. National Library Service gets over the problem by treating them as two regions which, with Auckland city, exhaust the North Auckland land district; though if the author of the plan had intended this interpretation she surely would have made South Auckland 13. Nor is it likely that she would have singled out the area of Pukekohe and the Hunuas in preference to the Waikato or Rotorua (to go no further). But other solutions are also unsatisfactory and some would run into difficulties from a third source.

This springs from the complication where subordinate classes are added at the same decimal place. There is often a great economy and convenience in doing this, as for example:

<sup>2</sup> *NZ Lib* 11:223-5 September 1948

## 941.5 IRELAND

- .6 Ulster
- .7 Connaught
- .8 Leinster
- .9 Munster

But such is best done all at once, rather than that the main class should first be given its -5 (or -6 . . .) and later the subordinate ones theirs; because items belonging to the subordinate classes must then have their numbers altered. It is one thing to add a number at the next decimal place to an existing call number—on the book itself or on its catalogue cards; quite another to have first to use an eraser, as anyone who has had to do this would testify.

The four counties of South Canterbury can as well take up the subdivisions 76/79 as the four provinces of Ireland their .6/.9 (after all it takes two decimal places more to give each Irish county its separate class). Mackenzie county, for example, might be 77; but it is a deterrent when the works concerned are not 7 but 75. 85 Southland and 87 Stewart Island offer still more complex difficulties.

Generally speaking it is unwise to open up a new decimal subdivision unless one can allocate rationally most of the nine places available or so arrange things that another later on can allocate the remainder. The use of -1 for capital cities for example creates no difficulties later. There does not seem adequate reason for the N.Z.L.A. plan's use of its final decimal place apart from capitals.

It is ironic that the N.Z.L.A. plan was introduced in some circles as a "classification suggested by H. L. James . . . revised" when it shares only one of its nine main classes with James and is structurally so different that it does not even provide a place for North Island or South Island. About James Miss Woodhouse<sup>3</sup> states: "... To the best of my recollection it was not considered as a possibility at all. It seemed to me better to make one that would fit with Dewey methods . . . never dreaming that they would start off with the little islands."

The James plan then was abandoned with no voice raised to save it, whereas it might have been revised and strengthened. So much is history. The N.Z.L.A. plan needs revision and it cannot be revised without a certain amount of trouble to the libraries using it. It would be as well to take this trouble early, however, for the trouble will be far greater if, unrevised, it is in its turn superseded.

### THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SUBDIVISION, 1949

The advantage of the N.Z.L.A. plan over James lay in its all-but-complete territorial definition and simplicity but when the General Assembly Library<sup>4</sup>, home of the James subdivision, decided to turn it out, it found the N.Z.L.A. scheme "inadequate . . . to the large number of books in the . . . library." It was felt there at that time undesirable to have "to refer to the catalogue when wanting material on a

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *NZ Lib* 12:156-8 July 1949

particular place"—a practice not obviated by the N.Z.L.A. plan when applied to a large collection. (The James Maori history provision also was felt too valuable to lose.) However, the geographical expansion that was worked out shared James's lack of territorial definition, and though the catalogue department has since rendered first-aid by mapping the areas the library has been disappointed in the scheme and is considering the adoption of the N.Z.L.A. plan after all. It now considers close geographical subdivision wrong.

Two public libraries adopted this subdivision, one of these the Canterbury Public Library. It is agreed that it is difficult of operation; but not that this is due to its being too close. It is still desirable, at least in a public library, to be able to consult the shelves directly; and in moderate to large collections the N.Z.L.A. plan is insufficient for this purpose.

#### D. C. 16TH EDITION SUBDIVISION

The establishment of the National Library Service's New Zealand printed catalogue card to the point where it has been accepted by Library of Congress as part of the *National Union Catalog* may have carried along with it a false sense of security in respect of the N.Z.L.A. New Zealand subdivision plan incorporated in it. Perhaps for this reason no further representations were made to the Lake Placid Club during the currency of the 15th edition. Perhaps also it was not realised how quickly the 16th edition was put in train to restore something like the closeness of subdivision that the 15th edition had pruned away. At all events a New Zealand subdivision was prepared by the Club for the 16th edition and it took no cognisance of that recommended by the Association. It is understood that a draft was sent to New Zealand and that after protest was made it was amended in some particulars, but generally the protest was disregarded and so in 1958 was published the 993.1 subdivision of that edition.

Here, minus redundancies, is the edition's geographic subdivision:

- 1 Outlying islands  
Including Chatham, Pitt, Auckland, Antipodes.
- 2 North Island
- 22 Auckland province
- 23 Taranaki province
- 25 Hawke's Bay province  
Including Gisborne land district
- 27 Wellington province
- 5 South Island . . . Stewart Island  
Including Nelson province
- 52 Marlborough province
- 54 Westland province
- 55 Canterbury province
- 57 Otago province Including . . . Southland land district
- 575 Stewart Island

(There is surely genius in the 575 touch)



It is almost incredible to a New Zealander that this could ever be taken seriously but the fact is that it is already accepted and used by *British National Bibliography* and (one can assume) by hundreds if not thousands of libraries all over the world. Here in New Zealand its advent was hardly even noticed, let alone loudly protested; and to the best of my knowledge only one library (a public library in the 10,000—20,000 population group) has applied it.

As to its faults, even the non-New Zealander will appreciate its prodigality with decimal places. Stewart Island apart; it takes two decimal places to achieve a provincial subdivision which James and the N.Z.L.A. subdivisions virtually achieved in one. The non-New Zealander may not appreciate that (to the present at any rate) North Island and South Island hardly rate as bibliographic entries—though it is a fault in the N.Z.L.A. scheme not to provide for them.

Other faults are:

(a) Opening instead of closing with Outlying islands. This gives a most misleading impression of their importance. Besides, the weight of these islands is to the south (especially since the Kermadecs are omitted.) They do not naturally precede Auckland but follow Stewart Island. (The move, it will be recalled, was made in the 15th edition—tht 16th only developed its implications.)

(b) Allowing unused numbers that might be useful later after Taranaki, Hawke's Bay, Wellington, but not after Auckland.

(c) With main numbers 6 to 9 unused (and so rendered henceforth unusable), the inclusion of Nelson province under the main South Island class.

(d) Lack of separate provision for the Southland land district, that quasi-province.

(e) Non-amenability to expansion (like the N.Z.L.A. and other province-based sub-divisions.)

One could also carp in the interests of territoriality (on which the subdivision is otherwise impeccable) at the inclusion of the Gisborne land district with Hawke's Bay province. Not all New Zealanders for that matter realise that there is a strip of intervening country, admittedly not very interesting, that is neither one nor the other.

#### OTHER DECIMAL SUBDIVISIONS

*U.D.C.* so far has no special geographic subdivision for New Zealand—though it has a uniform subdivision applicable to any geographic class which can be and in the schedules is applied to New Zealand—with not particularly bright results.

Lower Hutt Public Library has its own expansions of the main classes of the N.Z.L.A. plan—for which I am responsible. They are the worst of all.



## THE AUCKLAND INSTITUTE SUBDIVISION

The best decimal subdivision in use to date is one within the framework not of the *Decimal Classification* but of *Library of Congress*. It was devised by Miss Enid Evans for the library of the Auckland Institute and Museum one of the few really big collections of New Zealand material.

It is a county subdivision, and counties are its main territorial units. It is also a regional subdivision in that the counties are grouped in regions, and a provincial one in that the regions are grouped under provincial designations; but the territories of the provincial classes correspond to the contained counties, not to the provincial districts. In most cases this is done without strain to the provincial idea.

Following James, "Other Islands" come at the end of the Otago<sup>5</sup> class, which allows Marlborough a class to itself. Otherwise the subdivision at the provincial level resembles the N.Z.L.A. plan with common numbers as far as 5 Nelson; while the N.Z.L.A. order of provinces, though not its numbers, is followed from class 6 Marlborough to 9 Otago. If the Kermadecs are classified with Auckland province (they are not in it but are in the North Auckland land district) the Chathams similarly with Wellington, this is a neater solution than that of the N.Z.L.A. plan.

The regions singled out by Miss Evans for separate treatment are:

### 1 *Auckland province*

1 Northland, 2 Auckland metropolitan, 3 South Auckland (i.e., Manukau-Franklin), 4 Waikato, 5 Coromandel, 6 Bay of Plenty, 7 King Country, 8 Thermal, 9 East Coast

### 4 *Wellington province*

1 Rangitikei (includes Wanganui region), 3 Manawatu, 5 Wairarapa, 7 Wellington-Hutt metropolitan, with Hutt and Makara counties.

### 8 *Canterbury*

1 North Canterbury (Amuri, Cheviot, Waipara), 4 Mid-Canterbury (Kowhai/Ashburton), 8 South Canterbury

### 9 *Otago*

1 Central Otago, 2 Rest of Otago, 7 Southland, 8 Stewart Island, 9 Other islands

Many of the regional inclusions can be challenged but the essential thing is that they provide a convenient framework for the grouping of counties—for example:

### 14 *Waikato*

141 Raglan, 142 Waikato, 143 Waipa, 144 Piako, 145 Matamata, 146 Otorohanga

<sup>5</sup> Stewart Island, Solander and the subantarctic islands (Bounty, Antipodes, Snares, Auckland, and Campbell) are none of them in the Otago provincial district but all in the Southland land district.

In case of the small provinces the county subdivision is direct, e.g.

2 Taranaki

21 Taranaki (co.), 22 Clifton, 23 Inglewood, 24 Stratford,  
25 Eltham, 26 Hawera, 27 Egmont, 28 Waimate West, 29  
Patea

The dominance of the regional idea in the scheme is shown in the case of Waimarino county (part both of the King Country and of Wellington province) which is allocated to King Country—a subdivision of Auckland province. The King Country in fact overlaps three provinces (as also does one of its main counties, Taumarunui) which makes it a test case for an expanded scheme; but Waimarino county is some distance from the Auckland provincial border, and more still from that of the South Auckland land district. Whichever way such an issue is decided there will be anomalies.

The Auckland Institute subdivision, which is further subdivided for photographs, and is also applicable to map classification (it has been taken over by the Alexander Turnbull Library for the latter purpose) is important because it demonstrates the feasibility of subdivision to the county level in meeting the needs of a large collection. In structure it is superior to the N.Z.L.A. plan, but this superiority is hardly sufficient reason for superseding the N.Z.L.A. structure in the light of the burden of reclassification this would entail.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Auckland Institute subdivision was worked out within the framework of a variant *Library of Congress* subdivision.

Standard *Library of Congress* practice is to arrange geographic regions alphabetically (by Cutter number). The scope as well as the pitfalls of this are illustrated by reference to the printed examples under class DU430 (Local history—regions other than Wellington) which include:

A35 Akaroa

A4 Alps, Southern

Such arrangement is complex in administration and yet can be calculated to drive the enquirer back from the shelves to the catalogue so often that it is surprising that libraries give themselves so much trouble to follow it through. To find information on a particular locality on the shelves the inquirer must first assume that it will be written about directly under the name he knows it by—he will not find books on inclusive or partial or overlapping regions near where he is searching unless by chance the names begin with the same letters. From the viewpoint of elementary consistency the cataloguer is plagued with the problem of when to invert a compound place name such as Southern Alps, cited above. And is North Auck-

land approximately the same place as Northland or not? In one university library material on either or both will be found divided indifferently between A81 and N8.

In the University of Canterbury variant, within whose framework Miss Evans worked, an effort was made to avoid mixing up together non-cognate geographic entities (such as provinces, counties, towns) as happens under official *Library of Congress* procedure. To have carried out this plan, however, would have necessitated further provision for such entities as lakes and mountains; while the decision to regard "districts" as cognate with provinces has also led to confusion. Nor does the scheme avoid the problem of inverted names and synonymy already noted.

It will thereby be seen that the frustrations that drove Miss Evans into her monumental work were serious enough.

#### BLISS

Mr John Harris was responsible for the first adaptation and expansion of the Bliss class of New Zealand within the framework of *A System of Bibliographic Classification* 1935. His local history subdivision is a simple lettered arrangement of provinces from Auckland to Otago, while a subdivision of the latter province (the only one subdivided) follows in the same alphabetical sequence:

- T Otago
- U Dunedin city
- V North Otago
- W Central Otago
- X Southland
- Z Stewart Island

(It is unclear whether V and W are defined territorially.)

Six letters are available for analogous treatment of Auckland province, two for Wellington, one for Nelson, two for Canterbury.

In *A Bibliographic Classification*, v.3, 1953, Bliss so altered his History sections as to force reclassification; and at the Hocken Library, in process of changing over from its own Trimble<sup>6</sup> classification to Bliss, this has proved a useful opportunity to work out a new expansion including one for N.Z. local history. When this is complete it will be followed in the main Otago University library. The work done so far (as one would expect from Mrs Linda Rodda) is very good.

#### THE COUNTY AS A TERRITORIAL UNIT

The *Decimal Classification* uses the county as territorial unit in its geographical subdivision of the United States 974/9. (It also does so for England and some other nations but the test is what it has settled on as the best basis in its own home territory.) Objection to similar use of the county for New Zealand is made on the grounds that

<sup>6</sup> A curious more or less alphabeto-classed arrangement (e.g. N.,1 Newspapers, N.,2 New Zealand, N.,2a Auckland, N.,2b Canterbury . . .)



counties change. In the last decade (it is pointed out) Kawhia has disappeared (divided between Otorohanga and Waitomo), Taumarunui, once virtually confined to the Auckland province, has incorporated Ohura (Taranaki) and Katieke (Wellington), Masterton has incorporated Castlepoint, Mackenzie taken a large tract of high country from Geraldine, and so on. In the present decade it is expected (even devoutly hoped) that this process will continue—in fact it will probably never stop.

The answer to this is that classification schemes are themselves amenable to changes of quite analogous kind—and if there is no machinery for keeping them up to date from time to time they will surely pass away. County boundaries at any given time are an amalgam of geography and history: thus has constituted New Zealand society dealt with the problem of organising local government. County boundaries cannot be changed without very strong social and economic pressure; and, when changes occur, they are accompanied by publicity, formality, and new Lands and Survey department maps. They should be similarly accompanied every decade or so by suitably altered N.Z. L.A. local history schedules, just as changes in U.S. counties are provided for in each new edition of the *Decimal Classification*.

This means a job of reclassifying a few books from time to time. This admittedly is a nuisance—like having to shave or do other recurring chores. The alternative is a really major upheaval at somewhat longer intervals, and a lot of untidiness and difficulty in between.

#### CLOSE SUBDIVISION

Resistance to taking N.Z. local history divisions beyond the provincial level is often expressed as a general dislike of close subdivision, at least of close geographical subdivision. It is pointed out that expert users know their authors, and find them easily in broad author arrangements, with difficulty in close ones.

The view here adopted is that there is a degree of closeness of subdivision appropriate in any subject field to a given library at a given stage in the development of its collection; and in the light of the special requirements of its public, who may not be experts at all.

There should be a choice of degrees of closeness open to libraries. No one objects if some keep all local history at the broad New Zealand class while others group it provincially. If a choice was available, however, some libraries would group such material regionally, others again (especially in respect of material on their own domestic area) by counties and even occasionally county ridings; for in this way they would best guide the layman in New Zealand geography.

#### A REVISED N. Z. L. A. SCHEME

In the hope it may meet the needs expressed above a three-stage scheme is in preparation and a limited number of copies should soon be available from the Canterbury Public Library. (Orders should be placed now.)

The scheme is within a modified N.Z.L.A. framework. Stage I is by provinces territorially modified in terms of Stages II and III, Stage II by regional groups of counties, Stage III by counties or districts related to counties. There is also to be an index and a list of regional and district subject headings to tie in with class territories. If the scheme is adopted by the Association, machinery for bringing it up to date at appropriate intervals would need to be established.

In any case should we not together take a good look at the issues outlined here?

## BOOK REVIEW

TURNBULL, M. M. *Life on the Gold-Fields of the South Island of New Zealand*. Wellington, Library School, 1961. (Bibliographical series, no. 4) 22p. Photoprinted.

The publication of a series of bibliographical studies by students of the New Zealand Library School is an occasion for rejoicing. The School has begun to produce studies in librarianship which cater more particularly for local needs. By this contribution to professional literature the work of the School exhibits an increased maturity which should be commended. The publications sponsored by certain other library schools have an established position in scholarly literature. To achieve international status for the New Zealand School and its graduates, it is necessary that publications issued under its auspices exhibit a satisfactory standard of general scholarship and professional competence.

A consideration of the bibliography under review as a specimen example of the series raises certain questions. Those familiar with the programme of the School know that these bibliographies are compiled in a limited time as part of a crowded syllabus. Students must confine their work either to a narrow subject or to a restricted treatment of a wider subject if they are to produce satisfactory studies. These are exercises in bibliography and not to be judged as major contributions to library literature. This is not to decry their value, but to present the studies fairly some mention of their limitations should be made. An introductory statement by the Director of the School would be a suitable measure: the statement on the back of the title-page is insufficient. It would also add to the value of the study to know what libraries and bibliographies had been used in compilation.

Mrs Turnbull has produced a bibliography of a romantic period in our history. The literature of the subject is enormous, including official publications, unpublished material, illustrative matter, ballads, poems, newspaper and periodical articles and general works containing valuable incidental references. She has chosen wisely to limit her scope